

Claims 5, 20, 22-23 and 25-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0046247 (“Iwase”).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of U.S. Patent 6,725,300 (“Nagasaka”).

Claims 7, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of U.S. Patent 6,347,305 (“Watkins”).

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0184108 (“Takano”).

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of WO 01/40907 (“Carter”).

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS 1-4, 9-10, 12-16, 21, 24 and 27 --- 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 9-10, 12-16, 21, 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0017700 (“Homma”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as Homma fails to teach all features of Applicants’ claimed multifunction peripheral.

Claim 1 reads as follows (emphasis added):

A **multifunction peripheral** configured to perform the steps of:
 requesting device-related information from a network device over a network;
 receiving device-related information from the network device over the network;
 generating a device-related report based on said device-related information; and
 sending said device-related report to a recipient device.

The Office action states at page 2 item #2 that:

Homma '700 discloses a multifunction peripheral (100 in Fig. 1) configured to perform the steps of:
requesting device-related information from a network device over a network (paragraph [0075], lines 3-13, where a command is being made in order to retrieve information);
receiving device-related information from the network device over the network (paragraph [0076], lines 6-12, where if the information is stored in memory it is received by the requesting party); . . .

However, Homma fails to teach or suggest the two cited features of Applicants' claim 1, because the multifunction printer 100 in Homma fails both to request device-related information from a network device and to receive device-related information from the network device; instead, the multifunction printer 100 in Homma provides information back to a host computer 11 in response to a command sent by the host computer 11.

As explained in the Abstract of Homma when describing its multifunction printer in relation to a host computer, "[a]ccording to a command of a history acquisition job from a host computer, the history information is transmitted to the host computer." Thus paragraphs 0075 and 0076 cited in the Office action (and accompanying Fig. 9) describe a procedure in which a multifunction printer first awaits a command from a host computer. Upon receipt of that command, which includes a manager's ID and personal identification number, the multifunction printer compares the received identification information against its memory to authenticate the manager. See paragraph 0075.

Once authenticated, the multifunction printer determines whether there is history information to transmit to the host computer, and if so, to transmit the history information back to the host computer. See paragraph 0076.

The procedure thus described by Homma uses a host computer to request and receive information from a multifunction printer; the purpose of this procedure is further explained in Homma in paragraphs 0089-0090 and summarized in the final sentence of paragraph 0090 as:

This makes it possible to store the predetermined usage conditions of the peripheral device for every user or every operating mode without increasing the memory capacity of the peripheral device.

In other words, Homma teaches use of a host computer to fetch data from a peripheral device (or multifunction printer) so as to collect usage conditions from the multifunction printer without needing to increase its memory capacity. Absent a memory upgrade, the multifunction printer envisioned in Homma would be unable to collect and store information.

In contrast, the multifunction printer in Applicants' independent claim 1 is configured to request and receive device-related information from a network device. Therefore, Homma fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed method.

Claims 3-4, 9-10, 12-16, 21 and 24 are dependent on claim 1 and thus are not anticipated by Homma using the reasoning above for claim 1. Independent claim 27 recites the features of claim 1 in means-plus-function form, and is not anticipated by Homma using the reasoning above for claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 5-8, 11, 17-20, 22-23 AND 25-26 --- 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Each of claims 5-8, 11, 17-20, 22-23 and 25-26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of one of the following references: Iwase, Nagasaka, Watkins, Takano and Carter. These rejections are respectfully traversed. As previously shown, Homma does not teach "a multifunction peripheral configured to perform the

steps of: requesting device-related information from a network device over a network[, and] receiving device related information from the network device over the network.” None of Iwase, Nagasaka, Watkins, Takano and Carter cure the deficiencies of Homma as stated above, and no combination of Homma and one or more of Iwase, Nagasaka, Watkins, Takano and Carter teaches or suggests these claim limitations. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependent claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependent claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependent claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependent claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependent claims and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firm check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this

application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: April 24, 2008

/Samuel S. Broda #54802/
Samuel S. Broda
Reg. No. 54,802

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076